arXiv:1111.7292v7 [math.DS] 20 Aug 2012

NORM CONVERGENCE OF NILPOTENT ERGODIC AVERAGES ALONG FØLNER NETS

PAVEL ZORIN-KRANICH

Abstract. Multiple ergodic averages corresponding to polynomial sequences in nilpotent groups of measure preserving transformations converge in L^2, as was proved recently by Walsh. We extend this result to averages along Følner nets in amenable groups. We also generalize the double ergodic theorem for commuting actions of an amenable group due to Bergelson, McCutcheon and Zhang to averages with arbitrarily many terms.

1. Introduction

Let Γ be a locally compact amenable group with a left Haar measure $|\cdot|$, X be a probability space and G be a nilpotent group of unitary operators on $L^2(X)$ that act as isometric algebra homomorphisms on $L^\infty(X)$ (thus the group G comes from a group of measure-preserving transformations).

The *derivative* of a mapping $g\colon \Gamma \to G$ with respect to $a, b \in \Gamma$ is the mapping $D_{a,b}g(n) = g(n)^{-1}g(anb)$. A mapping $g : \Gamma \to G$ is called *polynomial* (of *scalar degree* $\leq d$) if for any $a_1, \dots, a_{d+1}, b_1, \dots, b_{d+1} \in \Gamma$ the mapping $D_{a_1,b_1} \dots D_{a_{d+1},b_{d+1}} g$ equals 1_G identically.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $g_1, \dots, g_j : \Gamma \to G$ be measurable polynomial mappings and $f_0, \dots, f_j \in L^\infty(X)$ be arbitrary bounded functions. Then for every Følner net $(F_\alpha)_{\alpha\in A}$ in Γ and any choice of $(a_\alpha)_{\alpha\in A} \subset \Gamma$ the limit*

$$\lim_{\alpha} \frac{1}{|a_\alpha F_\alpha|} \int_{m\in a_\alpha F_\alpha} f_0 g_1(m) f_1 \cdot \dots \cdot g_j(m) f_j \tag{1.2}$$

exists in $L^2(X)$ and is independent of the Følner net $(F_\alpha)_{\alpha\in A}$ and the shifts $(a_\alpha)_{\alpha\in A}$.

The study of nilpotent multiple ergodic averages (1.2) is motivated by Leibman's generalization [Lei98] of the Furstenberg multiple recurrence theorem [Fur77]. Our proof closely follows the groundbreaking argument of Walsh [Wal12] who considered the standard Følner sequence in $\mathbb{Z}$ without shifts (a_α) (his argument also works for the standard Følner sequence in $\mathbb{Z}^r$). In order to prove our result we have to address two additional issues not arising in the discrete setting $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}^r$.

The first is that the family of sets $\{aF_\alpha b\}_{a,b\in\Gamma,\alpha\in A}$ need not be directed by inclusion. However, it is directed by *approximate* (up to a small proportion) inclusion. This turns out to be sufficient for our purposes and gives uniform convergence over two-sided shifts $aF_\alpha b$ as a byproduct.

The second issue is that in general a function from a directed set to itself, unlike a sequence of natural numbers, cannot be majorized by a monotone function. Thus we have to avoid to pass to monotone functions.

Our main result (Theorem 9.1) also implies the following generalization of the double ergodic theorem for commuting actions of an amenable group due to Bergelson, McCutcheon and Zhang [BMZ97, Theorem 4.8].

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 37A30.

Key words and phrases. multiple ergodic averages, nilpotent group, polynomial mapping.

Theorem 1.3. *Let* $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_j$ *be measure-preserving actions of* Γ *on* X *that commute pairwise in the sense that*

$$\tau_i(m)\tau_k(n) = \tau_k(n)\tau_i(m) \quad \textit{whenever} \quad m, n \in \Gamma, \quad i \neq k$$

and $f_0, \dots, f_j \in L^\infty(X)$ *be arbitrary bounded functions. Then for every Følner net* $(F_\alpha)_{\alpha\in A}$ *in* Γ *the limit*

$$\lim_\alpha \frac{1}{|F_\alpha|} \int_{m\in F_\alpha} f_0(x) f_1(\tau_1(m)x) \cdot \dots \cdot f_j(\tau_1(m) \dots \tau_j(m)x) \tag{1.4}$$

exists in $L^2(X)$ *and is independent of the Følner net* $(F_\alpha)_{\alpha\in A}$.

The remaining part of this article is organized as follows. We begin with a very brief overview of other methods by which our problem has been studied in Section 2. A close look at the von Neumann mean ergodic theorem in Section 3 motivates the Walsh structure theorem. We continue with algebraic preliminaries in Section 4 and a streamlined treatment of Walsh's complexity in Section 5. The properties of Følner nets that are important for us are reviewed in Section 6. Sections 7 and 8 contain slight variations of the abstract structure theorem due to Gowers and Walsh and the inverse theorem due to Walsh, respectively. Finally we prove the main result in Section 9. In Appendix A we prove a right polynomial version of Theorem 1.1 as well as Theorem 1.3.

Our argument is presented for Følner sequences but applies directly to Følner nets upon replacing the natural numbers by the directed set A throughout. Without loss of generality we work with real-valued functions on X.

Acknowledgment. The author thanks Vitaly Bergelson for bringing the problem of convergence of the averages (1.2) to his attention.

2. CONVERGENCE OF MULTIPLE AVERAGES BY OTHER METHODS

Before Walsh's proof there existed basically two approaches to norm convergence of averages of the form (1.2): via characteristic factors and via analogs of the hypergraph regularity lemma. We do not attempt to give a full account of the history (an extensive bibliography on this and many related topics can be found in Frantzikinakis's survey [Fra11]) and only point out some developmets that occured since 2005.

(Partial) characteristic factors. Characteristic factors have been explicitely introduced by Furstenberg and Weiss [FW96]. The general idea is to take expectations onto some factors with desirable algebraic properties, show that this does not change the limiting behavior of the averages and analyze the averages on the factors.

The single most important kind of factors in this area are maximal nilfactors. They have been constructed independently by Host and Kra [HK05] and Ziegler [Zie07] using some earlier ideas of Conze and Lesigne. The two constructions lead to identical factors[1], but the approach of Host and Kra has the advantage that the factors are characterized in terms of *uniformity seminorms* (introduced in a special case by Bergelson [Ber00]).

By PET induction [Ber87] maximal nilfactors are characteristic for arbitrary polynomial averages involving one measure-preserving transformation [Lei05]. Convergence of the averages follows from Leibman's pointwise multiple ergodic theorem for nilsystems [Lei05b]. This information also allowed to characterize families of polynomials for which a multiple recurrence theorem holds [BLL08].

---

[1] In Ziegler's terminology k-universal characteristic factors $Y_k(X)$ are the maximal $(k-1)$-step pro-nilfactors [Zie07, Theorem 1.8] and the minimal k-characterstic factors, so they coincide with Host-Kra factors $Z_{k-1}(X)$ since the latter are pro-nilsystems and k-characteristic.

Commuting transformations. For commuting transformations one cannot in general expect nilfactors to be partially characteristic: this already fails for the simplest averages $\mathbb{E}_{n\in F_N} T_1^n f_1 T_2^n f_2$ with $T_1 = T_2$. But, under fairly mild assumptions that prevent such degeneracies, nilfactors do in fact happen to be partially characteristic.

The first possibility is to impose additional ergodicity assumptions on the commuting transformations T_i. Assume for instance that each T_i and $T_i T_{i'}^{-1}$, $i \neq i'$, is ergodic. Then the nilfactors associated to the different T_i's coincide and are characteristic for linear multiple averages involving the T_i's [FK05]. Moreover, if $(T_1, \dots, T_l)$ is a "totally ergodic generating set", meaning that $T_1^{c_1} \dots T_l^{c_l}$ is ergodic unless $c_1 = \dots = c_l = 0$, then the nilfactors are also characteristic for polynomial averages [Joh09].

The second possibility is to consider distinct degree polynomial iterates of general commuting transformations T_i (without any ergodicity assumptions). In this case the nilfactors associated to the T_i's are partially characteristic [CFH11].[2]

Continuous time. Characteristic nilfactors for $\mathbb{R}$-actions have been constructed by Potts [Pot09] who used them to prove norm convergence of polynomial multiple averages with continuous time. This problem can also be reduced to the corresponding problem for $\mathbb{Z}$-actions [BLM11].

Distal characteristic factors. Not every characteristic factor is created nilpotent. In fact, convergence of certain two-term averages corresponding to commuting actions of amenable groups [BMZ97] and $\mathbb{Z}$-actions that generate a nilpotent group [BL02] has been established using partial characteristic factors that are compact extensions of Kronecker factors without any appeal to a nilpotent structure.[3]

Hypergraph regularity. Another approach to convergence of multiple ergodic averages utilizes ideas surrounding the (infinitary) hypergraph regularity lemma. It has been pioneered by Tao in his proof of convergence of linear multiple averages corresponding to arbitrary commuting transformations [Tao08]. His proof was unconventional in two more aspects: the result was deduced from a finitary statement using a Furstenberg correspondence principle backwards and that finitary statement was a manifestation of the no-counterexample interpretation of convergence (Towsner later gave a non-standard proof [Tow09] that uses some of Tao's ideas).

Austin introduced the important device of "pleasant extensions" [Aus10] that in turn admit nicer characteristic factors than the original system does. This inspired Host to devise "magic extensions" that have similar properties [Hos09].

Although these methods deal with several commuting transformations in a very natural way, they do not seem to extend to the polynomial setting easily, basically because the Furstenberg self-joining lacks obvious invariance properties. Some progress in this direction includes Austin's proof that the averages $\frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^{N} T^{n^2} f \, T^{n^2} S^n g$ converge provided only that that T and S commute [Aus09, Aus09b]. The situation is better in the continuous time setting, where the Furstenberg self-joining is invariant under the *off-diagonal flow* [Aus11b, Theorem 3.4(C)], [Aus11, Theorem 1.1].[4]

---

[2] For ergodic T_i's appeals to the theory of uniformity seminorms on l^∞ in that article could be replaced by "vertical Fourier analysis".

[3] The latter paper contains an example of operators T and S that generate a solvable group of class 2 such that the averages $\frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^{N} T^n f S^n g$ do not converge.

[4] We remark that our Theorem 1.1 provides convergence of the averages in [Aus11, Theorem 1.2] on the joining (and not only of their expectations on the first factor) but fails to produce the invariance.

3. A CLOSE LOOK AT THE VON NEUMANN MEAN ERGODIC THEOREM

In this section we will illustrate Kreisel's no-counterexample interpretation of convergence with a (known) quantitative version of the von Neumann mean ergodic theorem for multiplicators on the unit circle $\mathbb{T}$. This tangible setting is used to explain several ideas that occur in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Throughout this section μ denotes a Borel measure on $\mathbb{T}$ and $Uf(\lambda) = \lambda f(\lambda)$ is a multiplicator on $L^2(\mathbb{T}, \mu)$.

Multiplicator von Neumann Theorem 3.1. *Let μ and U be as above. Then the ergodic averages $a_N = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{1\leq n\leq N} U^n f$ converge in $L^2(\mu)$.*

Proof. The averages a_N are dominated by $|f|$ and converge pointwise, namely to $f(1)$ at 1 and to zero elsewhere. □

It is well-known that no uniform bound on the rate of convergence of the ergodic averages can be given even if U is similar to the Koopman operator of a measure-preserving transformation [Kre78]. However there does exist a uniform bound on the *rate of metastability* of the ergodic averages. Let us recall the concept of metastability. The sequence (a_N) converges if and only if it is Cauchy, i.e.

$$\forall \epsilon > 0\, \exists M\, \forall N, N' (M \leq N, N' \implies \|a_N - a_{N'}\|_2 < \epsilon).$$

The negation of this statement, i.e. "(a_N) is not Cauchy" reads

$$\exists \epsilon > 0\, \forall M\, \exists N, N' \colon M \leq N, N',\ \|a_N - a_{N'}\|_2 \geq \epsilon.$$

Choosing witnesses $N(M)$, $N'(M)$ for each M and defining

$$F(M) = \max\{N(M), N'(M)\}$$

we see that this is equivalent to

$$\exists \epsilon > 0\, \exists F \colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}\, \forall M\, \exists N, N' \colon M \leq N, N' \leq F(M),\ \|a_N - a_{N'}\|_2 \geq \epsilon.$$

Negating this we obtain that (a_N) is Cauchy if and only if

$$\forall \epsilon > 0\, \forall F \colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}\, \exists M\, \forall N, N' (M \leq N, N' \leq F(M) \implies \|a_N - a_{N'}\|_2 < \epsilon).$$

This kind of condition, namely that the oscillation of a function is small on a finite interval is called *metastability*. A bound on the *rate of metastability* is a bound on M that may depend on ϵ and F but not the sequence $(a_N)_N$.

The appropriate reformulation of the von Neumann mean ergodic theorem for the operator U in terms of metastability reads as follows.

Multiplicator von Neumann Theorem 3.2 (finitary version)**.** *Let μ and U be as above. Then for every $\epsilon > 0$, every function $F \colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ and every $f \in L^2(\mu)$ there exists a number M such that for every $M \leq N, N' \leq F(M)$ we have*

$$\Big\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1\leq n\leq N} U^n f - \frac{1}{N'} \sum_{1\leq n\leq N'} U^n f \Big\|_2 < \epsilon. \tag{3.3}$$

Although Theorem 3.2 is equivalent to Theorem 3.1 by the above considerations we now attempt to prove it as stated.

Proof of Theorem 3.2. It clearly suffices to consider strictly monotonically increasing functions F. Let us assume $\|f\|_2 = 1$, take an arbitrary M and see what can be said about the averages in (3.3).

Suppose first that f is supported near 1, say on the disc A_M with radius $\frac{\epsilon}{6F(M)}$ and center 1. Then $U^n f$ is independent of n up to a relative error of $\frac{\epsilon}{6}$ provided that $n \leq F(M)$, hence both averages are nearly equal.

Suppose now that the support of f is bounded away from 1, say f is supported on the complement B_M of the disc with radius $\frac{12}{\epsilon M}$ and center 1. Then the exponential sums $\frac{1}{N}\sum_{1\leq n\leq N}\lambda^n$ are bounded by $\frac{\epsilon}{6}$ for all λ in the support of f provided that $N \geq M$, hence both averages are small.

However, there is an annulus whose intersection with the unit circle $E_M = \mathbb{T}\setminus(A_M \cup B_M)$ does not fall in any of the two cases. The key insight is that the regions E_{M_i} can be made pairwise disjoint if one chooses a sufficiently rapidly growing sequence $(M_i)_i$, for instance it suffices to ensure $\frac{12}{\epsilon M_{i+1}} < \frac{\epsilon}{6F(M_i)}$.

Given f with $\|f\|_2 \leq 1$ we can by the pigeonhole principle find an i such that $\|f E_{M_i}\|_2 < \epsilon/6$ (here we identify sets with their characteristic functions). Thus we can split

$$f = \sigma + u + v, \tag{3.4}$$

where $\sigma = fA_{M_i}$ is "structured", $u = fB_{M_i}$ is "pseudorandom" and $v = fE_{M_i}$ is L^2-small. By the above considerations we obtain (3.3) for all $M_i \leq N, N' \leq F(M_i)$. □

Observe that the sequence $(M_i)_i$ in the foregoing proof does not depend on the measure μ. Moreover a finite number of disjoint regions E_{M_i} suffices to ensure that fE_{M_i} is small for some i. This yields the following strengthening of the von Neumann theorem.

Multiplicator von Neumann Theorem 3.5 (quantitative version). *For every $\epsilon > 0$ and every function $F\colon \mathbb{N}\to\mathbb{N}$ there exist natural numbers $M_1,\dots,M_K$ such that for every μ and every $f \in L^2(\mu)$ with $\|f\|_2 \leq 1$ there exists an i such that for every $M_i \leq N, N' \leq F(M_i)$ we have*

$$\Big\| \frac{1}{N}\sum_{1\leq n\leq N} U^n f - \frac{1}{N'}\sum_{1\leq n\leq N'} U^n f \Big\|_2 < \epsilon,$$

where $Uf(\lambda) = \lambda f(\lambda)$ is a multiplicator as above.

The spectral theorem or the Herglotz-Bochner theorem can be used to deduce a similar result for any unitary operator. The argument of Avigad, Gerhardy and Towsner [AGT10, Theorem 2.16] gives a similar result for arbitrary contractions on Hilbert spaces. An even more precise result regarding contractions on uniformly convex spaces has been recently obtained by Avigad and Rute [AR12].

Quantitative statements similar to Theorem 3.5 with uniform bounds that do not depend on the particular measure preserving system allow us to use a certain induction argument that breaks down if this uniformity is disregarded. A decomposition of the form (3.4), albeit a much more elaborate one (Structure Theorem 7.2), will also play a prominent role.

4. POLYNOMIAL MAPPINGS

The definition of polynomial mappings given in the introduction has a serious disadvantage: unlike in the commutative case, the polynomials of scalar degree $\leq d$ need not form a group under pointwise multiplication.

This flaw has been rectified for polynomial mappings from groups into nilpotent groups by Leibman who introduced the notion of vector degree and showed that polynomial mappings of given vector degree form a group under pointwise operations [Lei02, Proposition 3.7 and erratum]. In this section we give a short review of this result in terms of prefiltrations instead of vector degrees. A *prefiltration* $G_\bullet$ is a sequence of subgroups

$$G_0 \geq G_1 \geq G_2 \geq \dots \quad \text{such that} \quad [G_i, G_j] \subset G_{i+j} \quad \text{for all } i,j \in \mathbb{N} = \{0,1,\dots\}. \tag{4.1}$$

A *filtration* (on a group G) is a prefiltration in which $G_0 = G_1$ (and $G_0 = G$). A prefiltration is said to have *length* $d \in \mathbb{N}$ if G_{d+1} is the trivial group and length $-\infty$ if G_0 is the trivial group. In this article we only consider prefiltrations for which one of these alternatives holds. If G is a nilpotent group then the lower central series is a filtration. For a prefiltration $G_\bullet$ of length d we define $G_{\bullet+t}$ to be the prefiltration of length $d-t$ ($=-\infty$ if $d<t$) on G given by $(G_{\bullet+t})_i = G_{i+t}$.

Recall that the discrete derivative of a map $g:\Gamma\to G$ is defined by

$$D_{a,b}g(n) = g^{-1}(n)T_{a,b}g(n), \text{ where } T_{a,b}g(n) = g(anb).$$

We define $G_\bullet$-polynomial maps by induction on the length of the prefiltration.

Definition 4.2. Let $G_\bullet$ be a prefiltration of length $d \in \{-\infty\}\cup\mathbb{N}$. A map $g\colon\Gamma\to G_0$ is called *$G_\bullet$-polynomial* if either $d=-\infty$ (so that $g\equiv 1_G$) or for every $a,b\in\Gamma$ the discrete derivative $D_{a,b}g$ is $G_{\bullet+1}$-polynomial.

In other words, a map $g:\Gamma\to G$ is polynomial if every discrete derivative is polynomial "of lower degree" (in fact we prefer not to define a "degree" for our polynomials since it is necessary to keep track of the prefiltration $G_\bullet$ anyway).

Recall that in the introduction we have defined a map $g\colon\Gamma\to G$ into a nilpotent group to be polynomial of scalar degree $\leq d$ if and only if

$$D_{a_1,b_1}\dots D_{a_{d+1},b_{d+1}}g \equiv 1_G \text{ for any } a_1,\dots,a_{d+1},b_1,\dots,b_{d+1}\in\Gamma.$$

This is easily seen to be equivalent with the present definition. Indeed, a polynomial mapping of scalar degree $\leq d$ is polynomial with respect to the filtration

$$G_0 \geq \underbrace{G_1 \geq \dots \geq G_1}_{d \text{ times}} \geq \dots \geq \underbrace{G_s \geq \dots \geq G_s}_{d \text{ times}} \geq G_{s+1} \tag{4.3}$$

(that refines the lower central series $G_0 = G_1 \geq \dots \geq G_s \geq G_{s+1}$ of G) since the $(d+1)$-th derivative of g vanishes identically and in particular takes values in G_2 (note that one cannot a priori say anything about the d-th derivative). On the other hand a $G_\bullet$-polynomial mapping has scalar degree $\leq d$.

Thus there is no ambiguity in calling a mapping polynomial. Moreover this shows that for any finite set of polynomial maps into a nilpotent group there is a filtration with respect to which they are all polynomial.

The next theorem is a version of Leibman's result that polynomial mappings form a group. It is a special case of results in [ZK12] with

$$\mathcal{T} = \{T_{a,b}:\Gamma\to\Gamma, n\mapsto anb, \text{ where } a,b\in\Gamma\}. \tag{4.4}$$

Theorem 4.5. *The set of $G_\bullet$-polynomial maps $\Gamma\to G$ is a group under pointwise operations and is shift-invariant in the sense that for every $G_\bullet$-polynomial g and $a,b\in\Gamma$ the translate $T_{a,b}g$ is also $G_\bullet$-polynomial. Moreover for any $G_{\bullet+t_i}$-polynomial maps $g_i\colon\Gamma\to G$, $i=0,1$, the commutator $[g_0,g_1]$ is $G_{\bullet+t_0+t_1}$-polynomial.*

Note that the second claim follows from the identity $Tg = gD_Tg$.

Remark 4.6. The polynomial maps of finite scalar degree fail to form a group if G is replaced by the dihedral group D_3 that is the smallest non-nilpotent group. Indeed, let δ be a rotation and σ a reflection in D_3, then $\delta^3=\sigma^2=(\sigma\delta)^2=1$. The sequences $(\dots,\sigma,1,\sigma,1,\dots)$ and $(\dots,\sigma\delta,1,\sigma\delta,1,\dots)$ are polynomial (of scalar degree ≤ 1) but their pointwise product $(\dots,\delta,1,\delta,1,\dots)$ is not.

If $\Gamma=\mathbb{Z}^r$ or $\Gamma=\mathbb{R}^r$ then examples of polynomial mappings are readily obtained considering $g(n) = T_1^{p_1(n)}\cdot\dots\cdot T_l^{p_l(n)}$, where $p_i\colon\mathbb{Z}^r\to\mathbb{Z}$ (resp. $\mathbb{R}^r\to\mathbb{R}$) are conventional polynomials and $T_i:\mathbb{Z}\to G$ (resp. $\mathbb{R}\to G$) are one-parameter subgroups.

For noncommutative groups Γ it is not evident that there exist any non-trivial polynomial functions $g\colon\Gamma\to G$ to some nilpotent group. However group homomorphisms are always polynomial, see [ZK12].

5. COMPLEXITY

In this section we give a steamlined treatment of the notion of *complexity* due to Walsh [Wal12, Section 4]. It serves as the induction parameter in the proof of our main theorem.

An ordered tuple $\mathbf{g} = (g_0, \dots, g_j)$ of measurable mappings from Γ to G in which $g_0 \equiv 1_G$ is called a *system* (it is not strictly necessary to include the constant mapping g_0 in the definition but it comes in handy in inductive arguments).

The complexity of the trivial system $\mathbf{g} = (1_G)$ is by definition at most zero, in symbols $\operatorname{cplx}\mathbf{g} \le 0$. A system has finite complexity if it can be reduced to the trivial system in finitely many steps by means of two operations, *reduction* (used in Proposition 9.4) and *cheating* (used in Theorem 9.1).

For $a, b \in \Gamma$ we define the (a, b)-*reduction* of mappings $g, h \colon \Gamma \to G$ to be the mapping

$$\left\langle g|h \right\rangle_{a,b}(n) = D_{a,b}(g^{-1})(n) T_{a,b} h(n) = g(n) g(anb)^{-1} h(anb)$$

and the (a, b)-reduction of a system $\mathbf{g} = (g_0, \dots, g_j)$ to be the system

$$\mathbf{g}^*_{a,b} := \mathbf{g}' \uplus \left\langle g_j|\mathbf{g}' \right\rangle_{a,b} = \Big(g_0, \dots, g_{j-1}, \left\langle g_j|g_0 \right\rangle_{a,b}, \dots, \left\langle g_j|g_{j-1} \right\rangle_{a,b}\Big),$$

where we use the shorthand notation $\mathbf{g}' = (g_0, \dots, g_{j-1})$ and $\left\langle g_j|(g_0, \dots, g_{j-1}) \right\rangle = (\left\langle g_j|g_0 \right\rangle, \dots, \left\langle g_j|g_{j-1} \right\rangle)$ and where the symbol "$\uplus$" denotes concatenation. If the reduction $\mathbf{g}^*_{a,b}$ has complexity at most $\mathbf{c} - 1$ for every $a, b \in \Gamma$ then the system $\mathbf{g}$ is defined to have complexity at most $\mathbf{c}$.

Furthermore, if $\mathbf{g}$ is a system of complexity at most $\mathbf{c}$ and the system $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$ consists of functions of the form gc, where $g \in \mathbf{g}$ and $c \in G$, then we cheat and set $\operatorname{cplx}\tilde{\mathbf{g}} \le \mathbf{c}$. This definition tells that striking out constants and multiple occurrences of the same mapping in a system as well as rearranging mappings will not change the complexity and adding new mappings can only increase the complexity, for example

$$\operatorname{cplx}(1_G, g_2, g_1 c, g_1, c') = \operatorname{cplx}(1_G, g_1, g_2) \le \operatorname{cplx}(1_G, g_1, g_2, g_3).$$

Note that cheating is transitive in the sense that if one can go from system $\mathbf{g}$ to system $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$ in finitely many cheating steps then one can also go from $\mathbf{g}$ to $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$ in one cheating step.

In general a system need not have finite complexity. We record here a streamlined proof of Walsh's result that that every polynomial system does have finite complexity. We say that a system $(g_0, \dots, g_j)$ is $G_\bullet$-polynomial for a prefiltration $G_\bullet$ if each g_i is $G_\bullet$-polynomial in the sense of Definition 4.2.

Theorem 5.1. *The complexity of every $G_\bullet$-polynomial system $\tilde{\mathbf{g}} = (g_0, \dots, g_j)$ is bounded by a constant $\mathbf{c}(d, j)$ that only depends on the length d of the prefiltration $G_\bullet$ and the size j of the system.*

The proof is by induction on d. For induction purposes we need the formally stronger statement below. We use the convenient shorthand notation $g(h_0, \dots, h_k) = (gh_0, \dots, gh_k)$.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $\tilde{\mathbf{g}} = (g_0, \dots, g_j)$ be a $G_\bullet$-polynomial system. Let also $\mathbf{h}_0, \dots, \mathbf{h}_j$ be $G_{\bullet+1}$-polynomial systems and assume $\operatorname{cplx}\mathbf{h}_j \le \mathbf{c}_j$. Then the complexity of the system $\mathbf{g} = g_0\mathbf{h}_0 \uplus \dots \uplus g_j\mathbf{h}_j$ is bounded by a constant $\mathbf{c}' = \mathbf{c}'(d, j, |\mathbf{h}_0|, \dots, |\mathbf{h}_{j-1}|, \mathbf{c}_j)$, where d is the length of $G_\bullet$.*

The induction scheme is as follows. Theorem 5.1 with length $d-1$ is used to prove Proposition 5.2 with length d that in turn immediately implies Theorem 5.1 with length d. The base case, namely Theorem 5.1 with $d = -\infty$, is trivial and $\mathbf{c}(-\infty, j) = 0$.

Proof of Prop. 5.2 assuming Thm. 5.1 for length $d-1$. It suffices to obtain a uniform bound on the complexity of $\mathbf{g}^*$ for every reduction $\mathbf{g}^* = \mathbf{g}^*_{a,b}$, possibly cheating first. Splitting $\mathbf{h}_j = \mathbf{h}'_j \uplus (h)$ (where $\mathbf{h}'_j$ might be empty) we obtain

$$\mathbf{g}^* = g_0\mathbf{h}_0 \uplus \dots \uplus g_{j-1}\mathbf{h}_{j-1} \uplus g_j\mathbf{h}'_j \uplus \left\langle g_j h | g_0\mathbf{h}_0 \uplus \dots \uplus g_{j-1}\mathbf{h}_{j-1} \uplus g_j\mathbf{h}'_j \right\rangle . \tag{5.3}$$

Note that for every $G_{\bullet+1}$-polynomial h' we have

$$\left\langle g_j h | g_j h' \right\rangle = g_j h (T g_j T h)^{-1} T g_j T h' = g_j h (Th)^{-1} T h' = g_j \left\langle h | h' \right\rangle \tag{5.4}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle g_j h | g_i h' \right\rangle &= D(h^{-1} g_j^{-1}) T g_i T h' = D(h^{-1} g_j^{-1}) g_i D g_i T h' \\ &= g_i D(h^{-1} g_j^{-1})[D(h^{-1} g_j^{-1}), g_i] D g_i T h' = g_i \tilde{h} \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

where $\tilde{h}$ is a $G_{\bullet+1}$-polynomial by Theorem 4.5. By cheating we can rearrange the terms on the right-hand side of (5.3) obtaining

$$\operatorname{cplx} \mathbf{g}^* \leq \operatorname{cplx} \left(g_0 \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_0 \uplus \dots \uplus g_{j-1}\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_{j-1} \uplus g_j \left(\mathbf{h}'_j \uplus \left\langle h | \mathbf{h}'_j \right\rangle \right) \right) \tag{5.6}$$

for some $G_{\bullet+1}$-polynomial systems $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_0, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_{j-1}$ with cardinality $2|\mathbf{h}_0|, \dots, 2|\mathbf{h}_{j-1}|$, respectively.

We use nested induction on j and $\mathbf{c}_j$. In the base case $j = 0$ we have $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{h}_0$ and we obtain the conclusion with

$$\mathbf{c}'(d, 0, \mathbf{c}_0) = \mathbf{c}_0.$$

Suppose that $j > 0$ and the conclusion holds for $j-1$. If $\mathbf{c}_j = 0$ then by cheating we may assume $\mathbf{h}_j = (1_G)$. Moreover (5.6) becomes

$$\operatorname{cplx} \mathbf{g}^* \leq \operatorname{cplx} \left(g_0 \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_0 \uplus \dots \uplus g_{j-1} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_{j-1} \right).$$

The induction hypothesis on j and Theorem 5.1 applied to $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_{j-1}$ yield the conclusion with the bound

$$\mathbf{c}'(d, j, |\mathbf{h}_0|, \dots, |\mathbf{h}_{j-1}|, 0) = \mathbf{c}'(d, j-1, 2|\mathbf{h}_0|, \dots, 2|\mathbf{h}_{j-2}|, \mathbf{c}(d-1, 2|\mathbf{h}_{j-1}|)) + 1.$$

If $\mathbf{c}_j > 0$ then by cheating we may assume $\mathbf{h}_j \neq (1_G)$ and $\operatorname{cplx} \mathbf{h}^*_j \leq \mathbf{c}_j - 1$, and (5.6) becomes

$$\operatorname{cplx} \mathbf{g}^* \leq \operatorname{cplx} \left(g_0 \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_0 \uplus \dots \uplus g_{j-1} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_{j-1} \uplus g_j \mathbf{h}^*_j \right).$$

The induction hypothesis on $\mathbf{c}_j$ now yields the conclusion with the bound

$$\mathbf{c}'(d, j, |\mathbf{h}_0|, \dots, |\mathbf{h}_{j-1}|, \mathbf{c}_j) = \mathbf{c}'(d, j, 2|\mathbf{h}_0|, \dots, 2|\mathbf{h}_{j-1}|, \mathbf{c}_j - 1) + 1. \qquad \square$$

Proof of Thm. 5.1 assuming Prop. 5.2 for length d. Use Proposition 5.2 with system $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$ as in the hypothesis and systems $\mathbf{h}_0, \dots, \mathbf{h}_j$ being the trivial system (1_G). This yields the bound

$$\mathbf{c}(d, j) = \mathbf{c}'(d, j, 1, \dots, 1, 0). \qquad \square$$

6. FØLNER SEQUENCES

In this section we introduce the tools needed for induction along a Følner sequence. From the several possible versions of the Følner condition we pick the weakest that suffices for our purposes. Recall that Γ is a locally compact amenable group and $|\cdot|$ is a left Haar measure on Γ.

Definition 6.1. A sequence $(F_N)_N$ of nonempty compact subsets of Γ is called a *Følner sequence* if for every compact set $K \subset \Gamma$ one has

$$\sup_{l \in K} |l F_N \Delta F_N| / |F_N| \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad N \to \infty.$$

Every summing sequence [Pat88, Definition 4.15] is in particular Følner in this sense and every σ-compact amenable group admits a summing sequence [Pat88, Theorem 4.16]. If the group is not σ-compact one has to use nets instead of sequences.

Note also that $(F_N b_N)_N$ is a Følner sequence for any shifts $(b_N)_N \subset \Gamma$ whenever $(F_N)_N$ is Følner. Thus we could replace the sets $a_N F_N$ in Theorem 1.1 by sets $a_N F_N b_N$, but no additional generality would be gained by doing so. It will nevertheless be crucial to work with estimates that are uniform over such two-sided translates in the proof.

We denote sets of the form $aF_N b$, $a, b \in \Gamma$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$ by the letter I and call them Følner sets. For a Følner set I we write $\lfloor I \rfloor = N$ if $I = aF_N b$ for some $a, b \in \Gamma$.

By the Følner property for every $\gamma > 0$ there exists a function $\varphi_\gamma \colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\sup_{l \in F_L} |lF_N \Delta F_N| / |F_N| < \gamma \text{ for every } N \geq \varphi_\gamma(L). \tag{6.2}$$

A finite measure set K is said to be *γ-approximately included* in a measurable set I, in symbols $K \lesssim_\gamma I$, if $|K \setminus I| / |K| < \gamma$. The next lemma states that the family of Følner sets is directed by γ-approximate inclusion.

Lemma 6.3. *For every $\gamma > 0$ and any compact sets I and I' with positive measure there exists a number $\lceil I, I' \rceil_\gamma$ with the property that for every $N \geq \lceil I, I' \rceil_\gamma$ there exists some $b \in \Gamma$ such that $I \lesssim_\gamma F_N b$ and $I' \lesssim_\gamma F_N b$.*

We use the expectation notation $\mathbb{E}_{n \in I} f(n) = \frac{1}{|I|} \int_{n \in I} f(n)$ for finite measure subsets $I \subset \Gamma$, where the integral is taken with respect to the left Haar measure. Note that the expectation satisfies $\mathbb{E}_{n \in aIb} f(n) = \mathbb{E}_{n \in I} f(anb)$ for any $a, b \in \Gamma$.

Proof. Let $K \subset \Gamma$ be compact and $\beta > 0$ to be chosen later. By the Følner property there exists a number N_0 such that for every $N \geq N_0$ we have $|lF_N \cap F_N| / |F_N| > 1 - \beta$ for all $l \in K$. Integrating over K and using Fubini's theorem we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \beta &< \mathbb{E}_{l \in K} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{b} \in F_N} 1_{F_N}(l\tilde{b}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{b} \in F_N} \mathbb{E}_{l \in K} 1_{F_N \tilde{b}^{-1}}(l) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{b} \in F_N} |K \cap F_N \tilde{b}^{-1}| / |K|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore there exists a $b \in \Gamma$ (that may depend on $N \geq N_0$) such that $|K \cap F_N b| / |K| > 1 - \beta$, so $|K \setminus F_N b| / |K| < \beta$.

We apply this with $K = I \cup I'$ and $\beta = \gamma \frac{\min\{|I|, |I'|\}}{|K|}$. Let $\lceil I, I' \rceil_\gamma := N_0$ as above and $N \geq \lceil I, I' \rceil_\gamma$. Then for an appropriate $b \in \Gamma$ we have

$$|I \setminus F_N b| / |I| \leq |K \setminus F_N b| / |I| < |K| \beta / |I| \leq \gamma,$$

and analogously for I'. □

7. The structure theorem

The idea to prove a structure theorem for elements of a Hilbert space via the Hahn-Banach theorem is due to Gowers [Gow10, Proposition 3.7]. The insight of Walsh [Wal12, Proposition 2.3] was to allow the "structured" and the "pseudorandom" part in the decomposition to take values in varying spaces that satisfy a monotonicity condition.

His assumption that these spaces are described by norms that are equivalent to the original Hilbert space norm can be removed. In fact the structure theorem continues to hold for spaces described by extended seminorms[5] that are easier to construct in practice as we will see in Lemma 8.6.

The Hahn-Banach theorem is used in the following form.

---

[5] An *extended seminorm* $\|\cdot\|$ on a vector space H is a function with *extended* real values $[0, +\infty]$ that is subadditive, homogeneous (i.e. $\|\lambda u\| = |\lambda| \|u\|$ if $\lambda \neq 0$) and takes the value 0 at 0.

Lemma 7.1. *Let V_i, $i = 1, \dots, k$, be convex subsets of a Hilbert space H at least one of which is open and each of which contains* 0*. Let $V := c_1 V_1 + \dots + c_k V_k$ with $c_i > 0$ and take $f \notin V$. Then there exists a vector $\phi \in H$ such that $\langle f, \phi \rangle \geq 1$ and $\langle v, \phi \rangle < c_i^{-1}$ for every $v \in V_i$ and every i.*

Proof. By the assumption the set V is open, convex and does not contain f. By the Hahn-Banach theorem there exists a $\phi \in H$ such that $\langle f, \phi \rangle \geq 1$ and $\langle v, \phi \rangle < 1$ for every $v \in V$. The claim follows. □

The next result somewhat resembles Tao's structure theorem [Tao06], though Tao's result gives additional information (positivity and boundedness of the structured part). Gowers [Gow10] described tricks that allow to extract this kind of information from a proof via the Hahn-Banach theorem.

Structure Theorem 7.2. *For every $\delta > 0$, any functions $\omega, \psi \colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ and every $M_\bullet \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists an increasing sequence of natural numbers*

$$M_\bullet \leq M_1 \leq \dots \leq M_{\lceil 2\delta^{-2} \rceil} \tag{7.3}$$

for which the following holds. Let $\eta \colon \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be any function and $(\|\cdot\|_N)_{N\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of extended seminorms on a Hilbert space H such that the sequence of dual extended seminorms $(\|\cdot\|_N^*)_{N\in\mathbb{N}}$ decreases monotonically. Then for every $f \in H$ with $\|f\| \leq 1$ there exists a decomposition

$$f = \sigma + u + v \tag{7.4}$$

and an $1 \leq i \leq \lceil 2\delta^{-2} \rceil$ such that

$$\|\sigma\|_B < C_i^{\delta,\eta}, \quad \|u\|_A^* < \eta(C_i^{\delta,\eta}) \quad \text{and} \quad \|v\| < \delta, \tag{7.5}$$

where the integers A and B satisfy $\omega(A) \leq M_i$ and $\psi(M_i) \leq B$ and where the constant $C_i^{\delta,\eta}$ belongs to a decreasing sequence that only depends on δ and η and is defined inductively starting with

$$C_{\lceil 2\delta^{-2} \rceil}^{\delta,\eta} = 1 \quad \text{by} \quad C_{i-1}^{\delta,\eta} = \max\Big\{ C_i^{\delta,\eta}, \frac{2}{\eta(C_i^{\delta,\eta})} \Big\}. \tag{7.6}$$

In the sequel we will only use Theorem 7.2 with the function $\omega(A) = A$, in which case we can choose $A = M_i$, and with δ and η as in (8.3).

Proof. It suffices to consider functions such that $\omega(N) \geq N$ and $\psi(N) \geq N$ for all N (in typical applications ψ grows rapidly).

The sequence (M_i) and auxiliary sequences (A_i), (B_i) are defined inductively starting with $A_1 = M_\bullet$ by

$$M_i = \omega(A_i), \quad B_i = \psi(M_i), \quad A_{i+1} = B_i,$$

so that all three sequences increase monotonically. Let r be chosen later and assume that there is no $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ for which a decomposition of the form (7.4) with $A = A_i$, $B = B_i$ exists.

For every $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ we apply Lemma 7.1 with V_1, V_2, V_3 being the open unit balls of $\|\cdot\|_{B_i}$, $\|\cdot\|_{A_i}^*$ and $\|\cdot\|$, respectively, and with $c_1 = C_i$, $c_2 = \eta(C_i)$, $c_3 = \delta$. Note that V_3 is open in H. We obtain vectors $\phi_i \in H$ such that

$$\langle \phi_i, f \rangle \geq 1, \quad \|\phi_i\|_{B_i}^* \leq (C_i)^{-1}, \quad \|\phi_i\|_{A_i}^{**} \leq \eta(C_i)^{-1}, \quad \|\phi_i\| \leq \delta^{-1}.$$

Take $i < j$, then $B_i \leq A_j$ and by (7.6) we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \phi_i, \phi_j \rangle| &\leq \|\phi_i\|_{A_j}^* \|\phi_j\|_{A_j}^{**} \leq \|\phi_i\|_{B_i}^* \|\phi_j\|_{A_j}^{**} \\ &\leq (C_i)^{-1} \eta(C_j)^{-1} \leq (C_{j-1})^{-1} \eta(C_j)^{-1} \leq (2\eta(C_j)^{-1})^{-1} \eta(C_j)^{-1} = \frac{1}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$r^2 \le \langle \phi_1 + \cdots + \phi_r, f \rangle^2 \le \|\phi_1 + \cdots + \phi_r\|^2 \le r\delta^{-2} + \frac{r^2 - r}{2},$$

which is a contradiction if $r \ge 2\delta^{-2}$. □

8. Reducible and structured functions

In this section we adapt Walsh's notion of a structured function and a corresponding inverse theorem to our context. Informally, a function is reducible with respect to a system if its shifts can be approximated by shifts arising from reductions of this system, uniformly over Følner sets that are not too large. A function is structured if it is a linear combination of reducible functions.

Definition 8.1. Let $\mathbf{g} = (g_0, \dots, g_j)$ be a system, $\gamma > 0$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$. A function σ bounded by one is called *uniformly* $(\mathbf{g}, \gamma, N)$*-reducible* (in symbols $\sigma \in \Sigma_{\mathbf{g},\gamma,N}$) if for every Følner set I with $\varphi_\gamma(\lfloor I \rfloor) \le N$ there exist functions $b_0, \dots, b_{j-1}$ bounded by one, an arbitrary finite measure set $J \subset \Gamma$ and some $a \in \Gamma$ such that for every $l \in I$

$$\Big\| g_j(l)\sigma - \mathbb{E}_{m \in J} \prod_{i=0}^{j-1} \big\langle g_j | g_i \big\rangle_{a,m}(l) b_i \Big\|_\infty < \gamma. \tag{8.2}$$

Walsh's definition of L-reducibility with parameter ϵ corresponds to uniform $(\mathbf{g}, \gamma, N)$-reducibility with $N = \varphi_\gamma(L)$ and a certain $\gamma = \gamma(\epsilon)$ that will now be defined along with other parameters used in the proof of the main result.

Given $\epsilon > 0$ we fix

$$\delta = \frac{\epsilon}{2^2 \cdot 3^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \eta(x) = \frac{\epsilon^2}{2^3 \cdot 3^3 x} \tag{8.3}$$

and define the decreasing sequence $C_1^{\delta,\eta} \ge \cdots \ge C_{\lceil 2\delta^{-2} \rceil}^{\delta,\eta}$ as in (7.6). It is in turn used to define the function

$$\gamma = \gamma^1(\epsilon) = \frac{\epsilon}{3 \cdot 8C^*}, \quad \text{where} \quad C^* = C_1^{\delta,\eta}, \tag{8.4}$$

and its iterates $\gamma^{\mathbf{c}+1}(\epsilon) = \gamma^{\mathbf{c}}(\gamma)$.

The ergodic average corresponding to a system $\mathbf{g} = (g_0, \dots, g_j)$, bounded functions $f_0, \dots, f_j$ and a finite measure set $I \subset \Gamma$ is denoted by

$$\mathscr{A}_I^{\mathbf{g}}[f_0, \dots, f_j] = \mathbb{E}_{n \in I} \prod_{i=0}^{j} g_i(n) f_i$$

and the difference between two such averages by

$$\mathscr{A}_{I,I'}^{\mathbf{g}}[f_0, \dots, f_j] = \mathscr{A}_I^{\mathbf{g}}[f_0, \dots, f_j] - \mathscr{A}_{I'}^{\mathbf{g}}[f_0, \dots, f_j].$$

The inverse theorem below tells that any function that gives rise to a large ergodic average correlates with a reducible function.

Inverse Theorem 8.5. *Let $\epsilon > 0$. Suppose that $\|u\|_\infty \le 3C$, the functions $f_0, \dots, f_{j-1}$ are bounded by one and $\|\mathscr{A}_I^{\mathbf{g}}[f_0, \dots, f_{j-1}, u]\|_2 > \epsilon/6$ for some Følner set $I = aF_N b$. Then there exists a uniformly $(\mathbf{g}, \gamma, N)$-reducible function σ such that $\langle u, \sigma \rangle > 2\eta(C)$.*

Proof. Set $b_0 := \mathscr{A}_I^{\mathbf{g}}[f_0,\dots,f_{j-1},u]f_0/\|u\|_\infty$, so that $\|b_0\|_\infty \leq 1$, and $b_1 := f_1,\dots,b_{j-1} := f_{j-1}$. Recall $g_0 \equiv 1_G$ and note that

$$\begin{aligned}
2\eta(C) &< \|u\|_\infty^{-1} \left\| \mathscr{A}_I^{\mathbf{g}}[f_0,\dots,f_{j-1},u] \right\|_2^2 \\
&= \left\langle \mathbb{E}_{n\in I} \prod_{i=0}^{j-1} g_i(n) f_i \cdot g_j(n)u, \frac{\mathscr{A}_I^{\mathbf{g}}[f_0,\dots,f_{j-1},u]}{\|u\|_\infty} \right\rangle \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{n\in I} \left\langle g_j(n)u, \prod_{i=0}^{j-1} g_i(n) b_i \right\rangle \\
&= \left\langle u, \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{m\in F_N} \prod_{i=0}^{j-1} g_j(amb)^{-1} g_i(amb) b_i}_{=:\sigma} \right\rangle .
\end{aligned}$$

We claim that σ is uniformly $(\mathbf{g},\gamma,N)$-reducible.

Consider a Følner set $\tilde{a}F_L\tilde{b}$ with $\varphi_\gamma(L) \leq N$. We have to show (8.2) for some $J \subset \Gamma$ and every $l \in F_L$. By definition (6.2) of φ_γ we obtain

$$\left\| \sigma - \mathbb{E}_{m\in F_N} \prod_{i=0}^{j-1} g_j(almb)^{-1} g_i(almb) b_i \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{|lF_N \Delta F_N|}{|F_N|} < \gamma .$$

Since $g_j(\tilde{a}l\tilde{b})$ is an isometric algebra homomorphism we see that $g_j(\tilde{a}l\tilde{b})\sigma$ is uniformly approximated by

$$\mathbb{E}_{m\in F_N} \prod_{i=0}^{j-1} g_j(\tilde{a}l\tilde{b}) g_j(almb)^{-1} g_i(almb) b_i .$$

Splitting $almb = a\tilde{a}^{-1} \cdot \tilde{a}l\tilde{b} \cdot \tilde{b}^{-1}mb$ we can write this function as

$$\mathbb{E}_{m\in F_N} \prod_{i=0}^{j-1} \left\langle g_j, g_i \right\rangle_{a\tilde{a}^{-1}, \tilde{b}^{-1}mb} (\tilde{a}l\tilde{b}) b_i = \mathbb{E}_{m\in \tilde{b}^{-1}F_N b} \prod_{i=0}^{j-1} \left\langle g_j, g_i \right\rangle_{a\tilde{a}^{-1}, m} (\tilde{a}l\tilde{b}) b_i ,$$

which gives (8.2) with $J = \tilde{b}^{-1}F_N b$ for the Følner set $I = \tilde{a}F_L\tilde{b}$. □

Structure will be measured by extended seminorms associated to sets Σ of reducible functions by the following easy lemma.

Lemma 8.6 (cf. [Gow10, Corollary 3.5]). *Let H be an inner product space and $\Sigma \subset H$. Then the formula*

$$\|f\|_\Sigma := \inf \Big\{ \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} |\lambda_t| : f = \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \lambda_t \sigma_t, \sigma_t \in \Sigma \Big\}, \tag{8.7}$$

where empty sums are allowed and the infimum of an empty set is by convention $+\infty$, defines an extended seminorm on H whose dual extended seminorm is given by

$$\|f\|_\Sigma^* := \sup_{\phi\in H : \|\phi\|_\Sigma \leq 1} |\langle f, \phi \rangle| = \sup_{\sigma\in\Sigma} |\langle f, \sigma \rangle| . \tag{8.8}$$

Heuristically, a function with small dual seminorm is pseudorandom since it does not correlate much with structured functions.

9. Metastability of averages for finite complexity systems

We come to the proof of the main result. Instead of Theorem 1.1 we consider the following quantitative statement that is strictly stronger in the same way as the quantitative von Neumann Theorem 3.5 is strictly stronger than the finitary von Neumann Theorem 3.2.

Theorem 9.1. *For every complexity* $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{N}$ *and every* $\epsilon > 0$ *there exists* $K_{\mathbf{c},\epsilon} \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that for every function* $F \colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ *and every* $M \in \mathbb{N}$ *there exists a tuple of natural numbers*

$$M_1^{\mathbf{c},\epsilon,F}, \dots, M_{K_{\mathbf{c},\epsilon}}^{\mathbf{c},\epsilon,F} \geq M \tag{9.2}$$

of size $K_{\mathbf{c},\epsilon}$ *such that for every system* $\mathbf{g}$ *with complexity at most* $\mathbf{c}$ *and every choice of functions* $f_0, \dots, f_j \in L^\infty(X)$ *bounded by one there exists* $1 \leq i \leq K_{\mathbf{c},\epsilon}$ *such that for all Følner sets* I, I' *with* $M_i^{\mathbf{c},\epsilon,F} \leq \lfloor I \rfloor, \lfloor I' \rfloor$ *and* $\lceil I, I' \rceil_{\gamma^{\mathbf{c}}(\epsilon)} \leq F(M_i^{\mathbf{c},\epsilon,F})$ *we have*

$$\|\mathscr{A}_{I,I'}^{\mathbf{g}}[f_0, \dots, f_j]\|_2 < \epsilon. \tag{9.3}$$

Recall that $\lceil I, I' \rceil_{\gamma^{\mathbf{c}}(\epsilon)}$ was defined in Lemma 6.3. Theorem 9.1 will be proved by induction on the complexity $\mathbf{c}$. As an intermediate step we need the following.

Proposition 9.4. *For every complexity* $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{N}$ *and every* $\epsilon > 0$ *there exists* $\tilde{K}_{\mathbf{c},\epsilon} \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that for every function* $F \colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ *and every* $\tilde{M} \in \mathbb{N}$ *there exists a tuple of natural numbers*

$$\tilde{M}_1^{\mathbf{c},\epsilon,F}, \dots, \tilde{M}_{\tilde{K}_{\mathbf{c},\epsilon}}^{\mathbf{c},\epsilon,F} \geq \tilde{M} \tag{9.5}$$

of size $\tilde{K}_{\mathbf{c},\epsilon}$ *as well as a number* $N = N_{\mathbf{c},\epsilon,F}(\tilde{M})$ *such that the following holds. For every system* $\mathbf{g}$ *such that every reduction* $\mathbf{g}^*_{a,b}$ *(*$a, b \in \Gamma$*) has complexity at most* $\mathbf{c}$*, every choice of functions* $f_0, \dots, f_{j-1} \in L^\infty(X)$ *bounded by one and every finite linear combination* $\sum_t \lambda_t \sigma_t$ *of uniformly* $(\mathbf{g}, \gamma, N)$*-reducible functions* σ_t *there exists* $1 \leq \tilde{i} \leq \tilde{K}_{\mathbf{c},\epsilon}$ *such that for all Følner sets* I, I' *with* $\tilde{M}_{\tilde{i}}^{\mathbf{c},\epsilon,F} \leq \lfloor I \rfloor, \lfloor I' \rfloor$ *and* $\lceil I, I' \rceil_{\gamma^{\mathbf{c}+1}(\epsilon)} \leq F(\tilde{M}_{\tilde{i}}^{\mathbf{c},\epsilon,F})$ *we have*

$$\Big\| \mathscr{A}_{I,I'}^{\mathbf{g}}[f_0, \dots, f_{j-1}, \sum_t \lambda_t \sigma_t] \Big\|_2 < 8\gamma \sum_t |\lambda_t|. \tag{9.6}$$

The induction procedure is as follows. Theorem 9.1 for complexity $\mathbf{c}$ is used to deduce Proposition 9.4 for complexity $\mathbf{c}$, which is in turn used to show Theorem 9.1 for complexity $\mathbf{c}+1$. The base case (Theorem 9.1 with $\mathbf{c} = 0$) is trivial, take $K_{0,\epsilon} = 1$ and $M_1^{0,\epsilon,F} = M$.

Proof of Prop. 9.4 assuming Thm. 9.1 for complexity $\mathbf{c}$. The tuple (9.5) and the number N will be chosen later. For the moment assume that $I, I' \lesssim_\gamma I_0$ for some Følner set I_0 with $\varphi_\gamma(\lfloor I_0 \rfloor) \leq N$. Consider the functions $b_0^t, \dots, b_{j-1}^t$ bounded by one, the set $J^t \subset \Gamma$ and the element $a^t \in \Gamma$ from the definition of uniform $(\mathbf{g}, \gamma, N)$-reducibility of σ_t over I_0 (Definition 8.1). Write $O(x)$ for an error term bounded by x in $L^\infty(X)$. By (8.2) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{A}_I^{\mathbf{g}}[f_0, \dots, f_{j-1}, \sigma_t] &= \frac{1}{|I|} \int_{n \in I} \prod_{i=0}^{j-1} g_i(n) f_i \cdot g_j(n) \sigma_t \\
&= \frac{1}{|I|} \int_{I \cap I_0} \prod_{i=0}^{j-1} g_i(n) f_i \left(\mathbb{E}_{m \in J^t} \prod_{i=0}^{j-1} \left\langle g_j | g_i \right\rangle_{a^t,m}(n) b_i^t + O(\gamma) \right) + \frac{|I \setminus I_0|}{|I|} O(1).
\end{aligned}$$

The first error term accounts for the L^∞ error in the definition of uniform reducibility and the second for the fraction of I that is not contained in I_0. This can in turn be approximated by

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{|I|} \int_I \mathbb{E}_{m \in J^t} \prod_{i=0}^{j-1} g_i(n) f_i \prod_{i=0}^{j-1} \left\langle g_j | g_i \right\rangle_{a^t,m}(n) b_i^t + \frac{|I \cap I_0|}{|I|} O(\gamma) + \frac{|I \setminus I_0|}{|I|} O(2) \\
= \mathbb{E}_{m \in J^t} \mathscr{A}_I^{\mathbf{g}^*_{a^t,m}}[f_0, \dots, f_{j-1}, b_0^t, \dots, b_{j-1}^t] + O(3\gamma).
\end{aligned}$$

Using the analogous approximation for I' and summing over t we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
(9.7)\quad & \|\mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{g}}_{I,I'}[f_0,\dots,f_{j-1},\sum_t \lambda_t\sigma_t]\|_2 \\
&\leq \sum_t |\lambda_t| \mathbb{E}_{m\in J^t} \|\mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{g}^*_{a^t,m}}_{I,I'}[f_0,\dots,f_{j-1},b^t_0,\dots,b^t_{j-1}]\|_2 + 6\gamma \sum_t |\lambda_t|.
\end{aligned}
$$

If G is commutative and $\mathbf{g}$ consists of affine mappings then the maps that constitute systems $\mathbf{g}^*_{a^t,m}$ differ at most by constants, and in this case one can bound the first summand by a norm of a difference of averages associated to certain functions on $X \times \uplus_t J^t$ similarly to the reduction in [Tao08, Section 5]. In general we need (a version of) the more sophisticated argument of Walsh that crucially utilizes the uniformity in the induction hypothesis. The argument provides a bound on most (with respect to the weights $|\lambda_t|/|J^t|$) of the norms that occur in the first summand.

Let $r = r(\mathbf{c},\epsilon)$ be chosen later. We use the operation $M \mapsto M_i^{\mathbf{c},\gamma,F_s}$ and the constant $K = K_{\mathbf{c},\gamma}$ from Theorem 9.1 (with γ in place of ϵ) to inductively define functions $F_r,\dots,F_1$ by

$$F_r = F, \quad F_{s-1}(M) = \max_{1\leq i\leq K} F_s(M_i^{\mathbf{c},\gamma,F_s}).$$

Using the same notation define inductively for $1 \leq i_1,\dots,i_r \leq K$ the numbers

$$\tilde{M}^{()} = \tilde{M}, \quad \tilde{M}^{(i_1,\dots,i_{s-1},i_s)} = (\tilde{M}^{(i_1,\dots,i_{s-1})})_{i_s}^{\mathbf{c},\gamma,F_s}.$$

The theorem tells that for every t, m and $1 \leq i_1,\dots,i_{s-1} \leq K$ there exists some $1 \leq i_s \leq K$ such that

$$(9.8)\qquad \|\mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{g}^*_{a^t,m}}_{I,I'}[f_0,\dots,f_{j-1},b^t_0,\dots,b^t_{j-1}]\|_2 < \gamma$$

holds provided

$$(9.9)\qquad \tilde{M}^{(i_1,\dots,i_s)} = (\tilde{M}^{(i_1,\dots,i_{s-1})})_{i_s}^{\mathbf{c},\gamma,F_s} \leq \lfloor I\rfloor, \lfloor I'\rfloor \text{ and } \lceil I,I'\rceil_{\gamma^{\mathbf{c}}(\gamma)} \leq F_s(\tilde{M}^{(i_1,\dots,i_s)}).$$

Start with $s=1$. By the pigeonhole principle there exists an i_1 such that (9.8) holds for at least the fraction $1/K$ of the pairs (t,m) with respect to the weights $|\lambda_t|/|J^t|$ (provided (9.9) with $s=1$).

Using the pigeonhole principle repeatedly on the remaining pairs (t,m) with weights $|\lambda_t|/|J^t|$ we can find a sequence $i_1,\dots,i_r$ such that for all pairs but the fraction $(\frac{K-1}{K})^r$ the estimate (9.8) holds provided that the conditions (9.9) are satisfied for all s.

By definition we have $\tilde{M} \leq \tilde{M}^{(i_1)} \leq \tilde{M}^{(i_1,i_2)} \leq \dots \leq \tilde{M}^{(i_1,\dots,i_r)}$ and

$$F_1(\tilde{M}^{(i_1)}) \geq F_2((\tilde{M}^{(i_1)})_{i_2}^{\mathbf{c},\gamma,F_2}) = F_2(\tilde{M}^{(i_1,i_2)}) \geq \dots \geq F_r(\tilde{M}^{(i_1,\dots,i_r)}) = F(\tilde{M}^{(i_1,\dots,i_r)})$$

for any choice of $i_1,\dots,i_r$. Therefore the conditions (9.9) become stronger as s increases. Recall from (8.4) that $\gamma^{\mathbf{c}}(\gamma) = \gamma^{\mathbf{c}+1}(\epsilon)$, thus we only need to ensure

$$(9.10)\qquad \tilde{M}^{(i_1,\dots,i_r)} \leq \lfloor I\rfloor, \lfloor I'\rfloor \text{ and } \lceil I,I'\rceil_{\gamma^{\mathbf{c}+1}(\epsilon)} \leq F(\tilde{M}^{(i_1,\dots,i_r)}).$$

This is given by the hypothesis if we define the tuple (9.5) to consist of all numbers $\tilde{M}^{(i_1,\dots,i_r)}$ where $i_1,\dots,i_r \in \{1,\dots,K\}$, so $\tilde{K}_{\mathbf{c},\epsilon} = (K_{\mathbf{c},\gamma})^r$.

We now choose r to be large enough that $(\frac{K-1}{K})^r < \gamma$. Then the sum at the right-hand side of (9.7) splits into a main term that can be estimated by $\gamma\sum_t |\lambda_t|$ using (9.8) and an error term that can also be estimated by $\gamma\sum_t|\lambda_t|$ using the trivial bound

$$\|\mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{g}^*_{a^t,m}}_{I,I'}[f_0,\dots,f_{j-1},b^t_0,\dots,b^t_{j-1}]\|_2 \leq 1.$$

Finally, the second condition in (9.10) by definition means that there exists a Følner set I_0 such that $\lfloor I_0\rfloor = F(\tilde{M}^{(i_1,\dots,i_r)})$ and $I, I' \lesssim_{\gamma^{\mathbf{c}+1}(\epsilon)} I_0$. In particular we have $I, I' \lesssim_\gamma I_0$

since $\gamma^{\mathbf{c}+1}(\epsilon) \le \gamma^{1}(\epsilon) = \gamma$. Taking

$$N = \max_{1\le i_1,\dots,i_r\le K} \varphi_\gamma(F(\tilde{M}^{(i_1,\dots,i_r)}))$$

guarantees $\varphi_\gamma(\lfloor I_0 \rfloor) \le N$. □

Proof of Thm. 9.1 assuming Prop. 9.4 for complexity $\mathbf{c}-1$. Let $\mathbf{c}$, ϵ, F and a system $\mathbf{g}$ with complexity at most $\mathbf{c}$ be given. By cheating we may assume that every reduction $\mathbf{g}^{*}_{a,b}$ $(a,b \in \Gamma)$ has complexity at most $\mathbf{c}-1$.

We apply the Structure Theorem 7.2 with the following data. The sequence of extended seminorms $\|\cdot\|_N = \|\cdot\|_{\Sigma_{\mathbf{g},\gamma,N}}$ is given by Lemma 8.6; the dual extended seminorms $\|\cdot\|_N^* = \|\cdot\|^*_{\Sigma_{\mathbf{g},\gamma,N}}$ decrease monotonically since $\Sigma_{\mathbf{g},\gamma,N'} \subset \Sigma_{\mathbf{g},\gamma,N}$ whenever $N' \ge N$. The function $\psi(\tilde{M}) := N_{\mathbf{c},\epsilon,F}(\tilde{M})$ is given by Proposition 9.4 with $\mathbf{c}$, ϵ, F as in the hypothesis of this theorem. Finally, $\omega(A) = A$ and $M_\bullet = M$. The structure theorem provides a decomposition

$$f_j = \sum_t \lambda_t \sigma_t + u + v, \tag{9.11}$$

where $\sum_t |\lambda_t| < C_i^{\delta,\eta} =: C_i \le C^*$, $\sigma_t \in \Sigma_{\mathbf{g},\gamma,B}$, $\|u\|^*_{M_i} < \eta(C_i)$ and $\|v\|_2 < \delta$. Here $\psi(M_i) \le B$ and the number $M_i \ge M_\bullet = M$ comes from the sequence (7.3) that depends only on ψ, M and ϵ and whose length $\lceil 2\delta^{-2} \rceil$ depends only on ϵ. Note that ψ in turn depends only on $\mathbf{c}$, ϵ and F.

We will need an L^∞ bound on u in order to use the Inverse Theorem 8.5. For this end let $S = \{|v| \le C_i\} \subset X$, then

$$|u| 1_S \le 1_S + \sum_t |\lambda_t| 1_S + |v| 1_S \le 3C_i.$$

Moreover the restriction of u to $S^\complement$ is bounded by

$$|u| 1_{S^\complement} \le 1_{S^\complement} + \sum_t |\lambda_t| 1_{S^\complement} + |v| 1_{S^\complement} \le 3|v| 1_{S^\complement},$$

so it can be absorbed in the error term v. It remains to check that $\|u 1_S\|^*_{M_i}$ is small. By Chebyshev's inequality we have $C_i^2 \mu(S^\complement) \le \|v\|_2^2$, so that $\mu(S^\complement)^{1/2} \le \delta / C_i$. Let now $\sigma \in \Sigma_{M_i}$ be arbitrary and estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle u 1_S, \sigma \rangle| \le |\langle u, \sigma \rangle| + |\langle u 1_{S^\complement}, \sigma \rangle| &\le \|u\|^*_{M_i} + \|u 1_{S^\complement}\|_2 \|\sigma 1_{S^\complement}\|_2 \\ &< \eta(C_i) + 3\|v\|_2 \mu(S^\complement)^{1/2} \le \eta(C_i) + 3\delta \cdot \delta / C_i < 2\eta(C_i). \end{aligned}$$

Thus (replacing u by $u 1_S$ and v by $v + u 1_{S^\complement}$ if necessary) we may assume $\|u\|_\infty \le 3C_i$ at the cost of having only $\|u\|^*_{M_i} < 2\eta(C_i)$ and $\|v\|_2 \le 4\delta < \epsilon/6$.

Now we estimate the contributions of the individual summands in (9.11) to (9.3). The bounds

$$\|\mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{g}}_{I}[f_0,\dots,f_{j-1},v]\|_2 \le \frac{\epsilon}{6} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{g}}_{I'}[f_0,\dots,f_{j-1},v]\|_2 \le \frac{\epsilon}{6}$$

are immediate. Proposition 9.4 for complexity $\mathbf{c}-1$ with $\tilde{M} = M_i$ (applicable since the functions σ_t are uniformly $(\mathbf{g},\gamma,\psi(M_i))$-reducible) shows that

$$\Big\| \mathscr{A}^{\mathbf{g}}_{I,I'}[f_0,\dots,f_{j-1},\sum_t \lambda_t \sigma_t] \Big\|_2 < 8\gamma \sum_t |\lambda_t| < \frac{\epsilon}{3}$$

provided that the Følner sets I, I' satisfy

$$\tilde{M}_{\tilde{i}}^{\mathbf{c}-1,\epsilon,F} \le \lfloor I \rfloor, \lfloor I' \rfloor \text{ and } \lceil I, I' \rceil_{\gamma^{\mathbf{c}}(\epsilon)} \le F(\tilde{M}_{\tilde{i}}^{\mathbf{c}-1,\epsilon,F})$$

for some $\tilde{M}_{\tilde{i}}^{\mathbf{c}-1,\epsilon,F}$ that belongs to the tuple (9.5) given by the same proposition. The former condition implies in particular $M_i \le \tilde{M}_{\tilde{i}}^{\mathbf{c}-1,\epsilon,F} \le \lfloor I \rfloor, \lfloor I' \rfloor$, and in this case the Inverse Theorem 8.5 shows that

$$\|\mathscr{A}_I^{\mathbf{g}}[f_0,\dots,f_{j-1},u]\|_2 \le \frac{\epsilon}{6} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathscr{A}_{I'}^{\mathbf{g}}[f_0,\dots,f_{j-1},u]\|_2 \le \frac{\epsilon}{6},$$

since otherwise there exists a uniformly $(\mathbf{g},\gamma,M_i)$-reducible function σ such that $\langle u,\sigma\rangle > 2\eta(C_i)$.

We obtain the conclusion of the theorem with the tuple (9.2) being the concatenation of the tuples (9.5) provided by Proposition 9.4 with $\tilde{M} = M_i \ge M$ for $1 \le i \le \lceil 2\delta^{-2} \rceil$. In particular $K_{\epsilon,\mathbf{c}} = \lceil 2\delta^{-2} \rceil \tilde{K}_{\epsilon,\mathbf{c}-1}$. □

This completes the induction and thus the proof of Proposition 9.4 and Theorem 9.1.

Corollary 9.12. *Let $\mathbf{g} = (g_0,\dots,g_j)$ be a system with finite complexity and $f_0,\dots,f_j \in L^\infty(X)$ be bounded functions. Then for every Følner sequence $(F_N)_N$ in Γ the limit*

$$\lim_{\lfloor I \rfloor \to \infty} \mathscr{A}_I^{\mathbf{g}}[f_0,\dots,f_j] \tag{9.13}$$

exists in $L^2(X)$ and is independent of the Følner sequence $(F_N)_N$.

Proof. We may assume that the functions $f_0,\dots,f_j$ are bounded by one and $\operatorname{cplx}\mathbf{g} \le \mathbf{c}$ for some $\mathbf{c} < \infty$. We use the abbreviations

$$\mathbf{g}f(m) = g_0(m)f_0 \cdot \dots \cdot g_j(m)f_j, \quad \mathbf{g}f(I) = \mathbb{E}_{m\in I}\mathbf{g}f(m) = \mathscr{A}_I^{\mathbf{g}}[f_0,\dots,f_j].$$

Assume that the functions $\mathbf{g}f(I)$ do not converge in $L^2(X)$ as $\lfloor I \rfloor \to \infty$. Then there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ such that for every $M \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist Følner sets I, I' such that $M \le \lfloor I \rfloor, \lfloor I' \rfloor$ and

$$\|\mathbf{g}f(I) - \mathbf{g}f(I')\|_2 = \|\mathscr{A}_{I,I'}^{\mathbf{g}}[f_0,\dots,f_j]\|_2 > \epsilon.$$

If one takes $F(M) := \lceil I, I' \rceil_{\gamma^{\mathbf{c}}(\epsilon)}$ this contradicts Theorem 9.1. Therefore the limit

$$\mathbf{g}f(\Gamma) := \lim_{\lfloor I \rfloor \to \infty} \mathbf{g}f(I)$$

exists. The uniqueness is clear for limits along Følner sequences since any two such sequences are subsequences of some other Følner sequence. The advantage of the averaging argument below is that it also works for nets.

Let $(\tilde{F}_N)_N$ be another Følner sequence in Γ. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given and take N_ϵ so large that

$$\left\|\mathbf{g}f(I) - \mathbf{g}f(\Gamma)\right\|_2 < \epsilon$$

whenever $\lfloor I \rfloor \ge N_\epsilon$.

Let N be so large that $|n\tilde{F}_N \Delta \tilde{F}_N| < \epsilon|\tilde{F}_N|$ for every $n \in F_{N_\epsilon}$. Then

$$\left\|\mathbb{E}_{m\in\tilde{F}_N}\mathbf{g}f(m) - \mathbb{E}_{m\in n\tilde{F}_N}\mathbf{g}f(m)\right\|_\infty < \epsilon$$

for every $n \in F_{N_\epsilon}$. Writing $O(\epsilon)$ for an error term that is bounded by ϵ in $L^2(X)$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{m\in\tilde{F}_N}\mathbf{g}f(m) &= \mathbb{E}_{n\in F_{N_\epsilon}}\mathbb{E}_{m\in\tilde{F}_N}\mathbf{g}f(m)\\
&= \mathbb{E}_{n\in F_{N_\epsilon}}\mathbb{E}_{m\in n\tilde{F}_N}\mathbf{g}f(m) + O(\epsilon)\\
&= \mathbb{E}_{n\in F_{N_\epsilon}}\mathbb{E}_{m\in\tilde{F}_N}\mathbf{g}f(nm) + O(\epsilon)\\
&= \mathbb{E}_{m\in\tilde{F}_N}\mathbb{E}_{n\in F_{N_\epsilon}}\mathbf{g}f(nm) + O(\epsilon)\\
&= \mathbb{E}_{m\in\tilde{F}_N}\mathbb{E}_{n\in F_{N_\epsilon}m}\mathbf{g}f(n) + O(\epsilon)\\
&= \mathbb{E}_{m\in\tilde{F}_N}\mathbf{g}f(F_{N_\epsilon}m) + O(\epsilon)\\
&= \mathbb{E}_{m\in\tilde{F}_N}\mathbf{g}f(\Gamma) + O(2\epsilon)\\
&= \mathbf{g}f(\Gamma) + O(2\epsilon).
\end{aligned}$$

Since ϵ is arbitrary the averages $\mathbf{g}f(\tilde{F}_N)$ converge to $\mathbf{g}f(\Gamma)$ as $N \to \infty$. □

Theorem 1.1 follows immediately from Theorem 5.1 applied to the polynomial system $\mathbf{g} = (g_0, \dots, g_j)$, where $g_0 \equiv 1_G$, and Corollary 9.12.

Appendix A. Right polynomials and commuting group actions

An inspection reveals that every occurrence of $a \in \Gamma$ and related objects $\tilde{a}, a_i, a^t, a_N, \tilde{a}_N \in \Gamma$ in this article could be replaced by 1_Γ (in fact we could restrict their values to any subgroup of Γ but we do not use this). This leads to the notion of right translation and right derivative of a mapping $g \colon \Gamma \to G$ that are defined by

$$T_b g(n) = g(nb) \quad \text{and} \quad D_b g(n) = g(n)^{-1} g(nb),$$

respectively. Right polynomials, right reduction $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_b$ and $\cdot_b^*$ and right complexity of systems are defined similarly to polynomials, reduction and complexity, respectively, with right derivatives in place of derivatives. Right Følner sets are sets of the form $F_N b$.

With these definitions we obtain an analog of Corollary 9.12 with complexity replaced by right complexity and Følner sets replaced by right Følner sets and an analog of Theorem 5.1 with polynomials replaced by right polynomials. Together they immediately imply the following analog of Theorem 1.1 for right polynomials.

Theorem A.1. *Let $g_1, \dots, g_j \colon \Gamma \to G$ be measurable right polynomial mappings and $f_1, \dots, f_j \in L^\infty(X)$ be arbitrary bounded functions. Then for every Følner net $(F_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ in Γ the limit*

$$\lim_{\alpha} \frac{1}{|F_\alpha|} \int_{m \in F_\alpha} g_1(m) f_1 \cdot \dots \cdot g_j(m) f_j \tag{A.2}$$

exists in $L^2(X)$ and is independent of the Følner net $(F_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$.

A second application of the analog of Corollary 9.12 described above deals with commuting actions of Γ without any further assumptions on the group G generated by the corresponding unitary operators. Note that a group action τ_i gives rise to an *antihomomorphism* $g_i \colon \Gamma \to G$, $g_i(m) f = f \circ \tau_i(m)$, i.e. a mapping such that $g_i(nb) = g_i(b) g_i(n)$ for every $n, b \in \Gamma$.

Proposition A.3. *Let $g_0 \equiv 1_G$ and $g_1, \dots, g_j \colon \Gamma \to G$ be antihomomorphisms that commute pairwise in the sense that $g_i(n) g_k(b) = g_k(b) g_i(n)$ for every $n, b \in \Gamma$ provided $i \neq k$. Then the system $(g_0, g_0 g_1, \dots, g_0 \dots g_j)$ has right complexity at most j.*

Proof. Every antihomomorphism $g_i \colon \Gamma \to G$ satisfies

$$D_b(g_i^{-1})(n) = g_i(n) g_i(nb)^{-1} = g_i(n)(g_i(b) g_i(n))^{-1} = g_i(b)^{-1}$$

and

$$T_b g_i(n) = g_i(nb) = g_i(b) g_i(n).$$

Thus for every $i < j$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle g_0 \dots g_j, g_0 \dots g_i \right\rangle_b &= D_b((g_0 \dots g_j)^{-1}) T_b(g_0 \dots g_i) \\ &= (g_0(b) \dots g_j(b))^{-1} g_0(b) g_0 \dots g_i(b) g_i \\ &= g_0 \dots g_i g_{i+1}(b)^{-1} \dots g_j(b)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $g_{i+1}(b)^{-1} \dots g_j(b)^{-1} \in G$ is a constant we obtain

$$\operatorname{cplx}(g_0, g_0 g_1, \dots, g_0 \dots g_j)_b^* = \operatorname{cplx}(g_0, g_0 g_1, \dots, g_1 \dots g_{j-1})$$

by cheating. We can conclude by induction on j. □

Theorem 1.3 follows from Proposition A.3 and the analog of Corollary 9.12 for right complexity.

REFERENCES

[AGT10] J. Avigad, P. Gerhardy, and H. Towsner, *Local stability of ergodic averages*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **362** (2010), no. 1, 261–288, available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/0706.1512`. MR2550151 (2011e:03082) ↑5

[AR12] J. Avigad and J. Rute, *Oscillation and the mean ergodic theorem*, 2012. Preprint, arXiv:1203.4124v1. ↑5

[Aus09a] T. Austin, *Pleasant extensions retaining algebraic structure, I*, 2009. Preprint, arXiv:0905.0518. ↑3

[Aus09b] ———, *Pleasant extensions retaining algebraic structure, II*, 2009. Preprint, arXiv:0910.0907. ↑3

[Aus10] ———, *On the norm convergence of non-conventional ergodic averages*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **30** (2010), no. 2, 321–338, available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1103.0223`. MR2599882 (2011h:37006) ↑3

[Aus11a] ———, *Equidistribution of joinings under off-diagonal polynomial flows of nilpotent Lie groups*, 2011. Preprint, arXiv:1105.5612. ↑3

[Aus11b] ———, *Norm convergence of continuous-time polynomial multiple ergodic averages*, 2011. Preprint, arXiv:1103.0223. ↑3

[Ber00] V. Bergelson, *The multifarious Poincaré recurrence theorem*, Descriptive set theory and dynamical systems (Marseille-Luminy, 1996), 2000, pp. 31–57. MR1774423 (2001h:37006) ↑2

[Ber87] V. Bergelson, *Weakly mixing PET*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **7** (1987), no. 3, 337–349. MR912373 (89g:28022) ↑2

[BL02] V. Bergelson and A. Leibman, *A nilpotent Roth theorem*, Invent. Math. **147** (2002), no. 2, 429–470, available at `http://www.math.osu.edu/~bergelson.1/NilRoth.pdf`. MR1881925 (2003a:37002) ↑3

[BLL08] V. Bergelson, A. Leibman, and E. Lesigne, *Intersective polynomials and the polynomial Szemerédi theorem*, Adv. Math. **219** (2008), no. 1, 369–388, available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/0710.4862`. MR2435427 (2009e:37004) ↑2

[BLM11] V. Bergelson, A. Leibman, and C. G. Moreira, *Form discrete- to continuous-time ergodic theorems*, 2011. Preprint, arXiv:1109.1800v1. ↑3

[BMZ97] V. Bergelson, R. McCutcheon, and Q. Zhang, *A Roth theorem for amenable groups*, Amer. J. Math. **119** (1997), no. 6, 1173–1211, available at `http://www.math.osu.edu/~bergelson.1/bmzamenroth12aug97.pdf`. MR1481813 (98k:28028) ↑1, 3

[CFH11] Q. Chu, N. Frantzikinakis, and B. Host, *Ergodic averages of commuting transformations with distinct degree polynomial iterates*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) **102** (2011), no. 5, 801–842, available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/0912.2641`. MR2795725 ↑3

[FK05] N. Frantzikinakis and B. Kra, *Convergence of multiple ergodic averages for some commuting transformations*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **25** (2005), no. 3, 799–809, available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/math/0406360`. MR2142946 (2007b:37009) ↑3

[Fra11] N. Frantzikinakis, *Some open problems on multiple ergodic averages*, 2011. Survey, see `http://www.math.uoc.gr/~nikosf/OpenProblems.html`. ↑2

[Fur77] H. Furstenberg, *Ergodic behavior of diagonal measures and a theorem of Szemerédi on arithmetic progressions*, J. Analyse Math. **31** (1977), 204–256. MR0498471 (58 #16583) ↑1

[FW96] H. Furstenberg and B. Weiss, *A mean ergodic theorem for* $(1/N)\sum_{n=1}^{N} f(T^n x)g(T^{n^2}x)$, Convergence in ergodic theory and probability (Columbus, OH, 1993), 1996, pp. 193–227. MR1412607 (98e:28019) ↑2

[Gow10] W. T. Gowers, *Decompositions, approximate structure, transference, and the Hahn-Banach theorem*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. **42** (2010), no. 4, 573–606, available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/0811.3103`. MR2669681 (2011k:11015) ↑9, 10, 12

[HK05] B. Host and B. Kra, *Nonconventional ergodic averages and nilmanifolds*, Ann. of Math. (2) **161** (2005), no. 1, 397–488. MR2150389 (2007b:37004) ↑2

[Hos09] B. Host, *Ergodic seminorms for commuting transformations and applications*, Studia Math. **195** (2009), no. 1, 31–49, available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/0811.3703`. MR2539560 (2010h:37003) ↑3

[Joh09] M. C. R. Johnson, *Convergence of polynomial ergodic averages of several variables for some commuting transformations*, Illinois J. Math. **53** (2009), no. 3, 865–882 (2010), available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/0906.3266`. MR2727359 ↑3

[Kre78] U. Krengel, *On the speed of convergence in the ergodic theorem*, Monatsh. Math. **86** (1978/79), no. 1, 3–6. MR510630 (80h:28025) ↑4

[Lei02] A. Leibman, *Polynomial mappings of groups*, Israel J. Math. **129** (2002), 29–60, available at `http://www.math.osu.edu/~leibman.1/preprints/PolMapG.pdf`. with erratum. MR1910931 (2003g:20060) ↑5

[Lei05a] ———, *Convergence of multiple ergodic averages along polynomials of several variables*, Israel J. Math. **146** (2005), 303–315, available at `http://www.math.osu.edu/~leibman.1/preprints/ConvPol.pdf`. MR2151605 (2006c:28016) ↑2

[Lei05b] ———, *Pointwise convergence of ergodic averages for polynomial actions of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ by translations on a nilmanifold*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **25** (2005), no. 1, 215–225, available at `http://www.math.osu.edu/~leibman.1/preprints/MulNilRtn.pdf`. MR2122920 (2006j:37005) ↑2

[Lei98] ———, *Multiple recurrence theorem for measure preserving actions of a nilpotent group*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **8** (1998), no. 5, 853–931, available at `http://www.math.osu.edu/~leibman.1/preprints/NilSz.pdf`. MR1650102 (99k:28019) ↑1

[Pat88] A. L. T. Paterson, *Amenability*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 29, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1988. MR961261 (90e:43001) ↑9

[Pot09] A. Potts, *Multiple ergodic averages for flows and an application*, 2009. Preprint, arXiv:0910.3687. ↑3

[Tao06] T. Tao, *A quantitative ergodic theory proof of Szemerédi's theorem*, Electron. J. Combin. **13** (2006), no. 1, Research Paper 99, 49 pp. (electronic), available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/math/0405251`. MR2274314 (2007i:37016) ↑10

[Tao08] ———, *Norm convergence of multiple ergodic averages for commuting transformations*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **28** (2008), no. 2, 657–688, available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/0707.1117`. MR2408398 (2009k:37012) ↑3, 14

[Tow09] H. Towsner, *Convergence of diagonal ergodic averages*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **29** (2009), no. 4, 1309–1326, available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/0711.1180`. MR2529651 (2010f:37005) ↑3

[Wal12] M. N. Walsh, *Norm convergence of nilpotent ergodic averages*, Ann. of Math. (2) **175** (2012), no. 3, 1667–1688, available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1109.2922`. ↑1, 7, 9

[Zie07] T. Ziegler, *Universal characteristic factors and Furstenberg averages*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **20** (2007), no. 1, 53–97 (electronic), available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/math/0403212`. MR2257397 (2007j:37004) ↑2

[ZK12] P. Zorin-Kranich, *A nilpotent IP polynomial multiple recurrence theorem*, 2012. Preprint, arXiv:1206.0287. ↑6

KORTEWEG-DE VRIES INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM, P.O. BOX 94248, 1090 GE AMSTERDAM, THE NETHERLANDS
E-mail address: `zorin-kranich@uva.nl`
URL: `http://staff.science.uva.nl/~pavelz/`